

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	. 1	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/714,934	<u> </u>	11/18/2003	Kevin Colleran	IDL0002-US	3049	
27510	7590	10/06/2006		EXAMINER		
		CKTON LLP	PATEL, JAGDISH			
607 14TH STREET, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20005				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
				3693		
				DATE MAILED: 10/06/2000	DATE MAILED: 10/06/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)					
	_	10/714,934	COLLERAN ET AL.					
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
		JAGDISH PATEL	3693					
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication or Reply	appears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address					
A SHOWHIC - External after - If NO - Failu Any I	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RECHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING asions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CF SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication per to reply is specified above, the maximum statutory per to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by streply received by the Office later than three months after the med patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	G DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIO R 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be ti i. iniod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from tatute, cause the application to become ABANDONI	N. mely filed n the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
Status								
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 1	8 November 2003.						
•—	•	This action is non-final.						
3) 🗌	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is							
	closed in accordance with the practice und	er <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 4	53 O.G. 213.					
Dispositi	ion of Claims							
,	Claim(s) <u>1-30</u> is/are pending in the applica							
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
·	Claim(s) 1-30 is/are rejected.							
•	Claim(s) is/are objected to.							
	Claim(s) are subject to restriction ar	nd/or election requirement.						
Annlicati	ion Papers							
	The specification is objected to by the Exan	niner						
,	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)		Examiner.					
.0,	Applicant may not request that any objection to							
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the co							
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the							
Priority ι	under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fore ☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:	eign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a	a)-(d) or (f).					
	1. Certified copies of the priority docum	nents have been received.						
	2. Certified copies of the priority docum							
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the		ved in this National Stage					
	application from the International Bu							
* 5	See the attached detailed Office action for a	list of the certified copies not receiv	ed.					
Attachmen	rt(s)							
	te of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summar Paper No(s)/Mail D						
3) Infor	ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948 mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) er No(s)/Mail Date	5) Notice of Informal 6) Other:						

Application/Control Number: 10/714,934

Art Unit: 3693

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

1. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

- 2. Claims 13-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. See explanation below.
- 3. Claims 13-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the disclosed invention is inoperative and therefore lacks utility.

Alternatively

The claims are nonfunctional descriptive material, per se. There is no computer-readable medium recited and even if there was a medium, the information recited, i.e. "first record", "second record", "first graphical representation" is not functional descriptive material. In other words, this is not directed to an executable program or a data structure that would control a computer, it is just a collection of data stored on a computer readable medium. Such collection of data is not capable of imparting functionality when acted upon by a computer.

Based upon the foregoing analysis, the claims 13-30 recites non-statutory subject matter are accordingly rejected under 35 USC 101.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

Application/Control Number: 10/714,934 Page 3

Art Unit: 3693

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claim 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being clearly anticipated by Burakoff et al. (US Pat. 7028190) (hereafter Burakoff).

As per claim Burakoff teaches a Method and System for delivery of sensitive information. As such Burakoff teaches critical steps of the invention including the first exercise, the second exercise and the third exercise by the recipient of the sensitive information. (Please refer to DESCRIPTION and Figure 5). In this manner, all process steps if the claimed invention are explicitly disclosed or inherent in the Burakoff reference.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 7. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:
 - 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
 - 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
 - 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.

Application/Control Number: 10/714,934

Art Unit: 3693

4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

8. Claims 13-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Burakoff.As per claim 1 analysis, Burakoff teaches all functional elements of claim 13.

Burakoff fails teach that the process is presented in a form of graphical representation of various data structure communicated using programmed computer modules.

Official Notice is taken that communicating commercial transaction data and other information in the form of graphical information and allowing the recipient of the information to access via graphical display is old and well known.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify Burakoff by implementing graphical representation of various data structures required in the electronic delivery system and recited in the instant claims because this would facilitate easy access to the information and more efficient and faster response to the requested information from the recipient of the sensitive information.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JAGDISH PATEL whose telephone number is (571) 272-6748.

The examiner can normally be reached on 300AM-630PM Mon-Two and Three.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Trammel can be reached on (571) 272-6712. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 517-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/714,934 Page 5

Art Unit: 3693

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Jagdish N. Patel

(Primary Examiner, AU 3693)

10/2/06